

University of Dayton

eCommons

Common Academic Program Committee
Minutes

Academic Senate Committees

9-2016

2016-09-22 Common Academic Program Committee Minutes

University of Dayton, Common Academic Program Committee

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/capc_mins

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton, Common Academic Program Committee, "2016-09-22 Common Academic Program Committee Minutes" (2016). *Common Academic Program Committee Minutes*. 59.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/capc_mins/59

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate Committees at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Common Academic Program Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlangen1@udayton.edu.

CAP COMMITTEE

Thursday, September 22, 2016 | 11:00 a.m.-12:15 p.m.; Kennedy Union 312

Present: Brad Balser, Lee Dixon, Serdar Durmusoglu, Heidi Gauder, Linda Hartley (*ex officio*), Keigo Hirakawa, Sawyer Hunley, Fred Jenkins (*ex officio*), Danielle Poe, Bill Trollinger, John White, Shuang-Ye Wu

Excused: Terence Lau (*ex officio*), Scott Segalewitz (*ex officio*)

I. 4-Year Review of CAP Courses

- A. Document: Department chair letter for the 24 CAP courses up for 4-year review in 2016-17 (8/30/2016)
- B. Discussion
 1. An overview was provided about the two-hour session held earlier in the day for departments with courses up for the four-year review this year. There were presentations from the English Department, CMM 100, and SSC 200 about different approaches for conducting assessment. The session was useful for participants and presenters to hear where different departments are in terms of assessment experience. Departments have already begun thinking about the four-year review process beyond the initial 24 courses up for review this year and would like to start planning longer term. The CAPC and APC will need to consider the impact if the process shifts from what has been developed for this year. Last spring the APC had provided a charge to the CAPC how to handle the course renewals this year and decided that further discussion would take place this year to determine the process going forward.
 2. University-wide system for learning outcomes: A question was raised whether such a system could be developed to collect information about how learning outcomes are met. This could be considered as a long-term goal. Departments should have autonomy to develop assessment approaches that are meaningful to them.
 3. Qualities the CAPC would look for in responses to the six questions for the four-year review: The committee agreed that departments that don't already have assessment plans in place and haven't yet collected data are not expected to provide data by the time the four-year review responses are due (February 15, 2017 for the 24 courses up for review this year). Rather, departments in this situation would be asked to develop a plan for conducting assessment that would yield meaningful data regarding how the HIR Student Learning Outcomes are being met through the course objectives.
 4. CAPC actions on course proposals for the four-year review: The committee discussed the following options:
 - a. Proposal is re-approved
 - b. Proposal is provisionally re-approved for two years
 - c. Proposal is withdrawn from consideration
 - d. Proposal is not re-approved (CAP status would be removed.)The provisional re-approval option would be used in cases where the department doesn't already have an assessment plan in place. This approach was reviewed with the Academic Senate president, who thought that it seemed reasonable within the charge the APC gave to the CAPC for the four-year review process this year. If the process changes after this year, courses given provisional re-approval for two years would not be impacted.

The committee recognized that some CAP courses might not be offered frequently within a four-year period and, therefore, might not have time to make adjustments based on experience delivering them. The committee discussed the possibility of establishing a longer review cycle (six years) for such courses and maintaining a four-year cycle for those offered every year. The Registrar's Office can assist with generating reports for how often courses are offered. Ultimately, the committee recommended maintaining a four-year cycle for all CAP courses and issues can be addressed as part of departmental conversations with the CAPC when courses are considered for renewal.

A course would not be re-approved and CAP status would be removed if a department does not have an assessment plan in place and does not develop one by the time the four-year responses are due. The committee's perspective is that its function is to review proposals and make recommendations and that action to remove CAP status should come from the APC or the Provost's Office.

The committee discussed the need to add voting options for the four-year review process to the CAPC Procedures.

5. Units' involvement: The College of Arts and Sciences is developing a policy document for the AAC about how to handle the four-year review process at the unit level. It proposes that the CAPC will communicate results of reviews to the AAC Executive Committee. If there are changes to the course based on the four-year review process (e.g., changes to the SLOs or CAP components), the AAC Executive Committee would have the authority to approve changes rather than taking them to the full AAC. The professional schools will need to consider how they will handle the four-year review process within their unit.
6. Proposal to the APC: The committee expressed a need to communicate with departments soon about how the four-year review process will be handled beyond this year since departments have asked about their review schedules and also have discussed developing assessment systems based on the six questions in place this year. There is also concern that momentum and buy-in for assessment will be negatively impacted if the process changes significantly. There was extensive consultation over the summer to finalize the six questions; the overall response was that the questions are sufficient and acceptable and are broad enough that they should work for everyone. There was a suggestion to leave the six questions in place for a certain number of years rather than considering this year a pilot year for the process. The committee agreed that a proposal to the APC should be drafted and discussed at a future meeting. It should include issues raised in this meeting. The CAPC Procedures will be amended based on the proposal to the APC.

II. CAPC Course Review Guidelines

- A. Documents: (1) CAPC course review guidelines for all CAP components; (2) Required HIR Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for CAP components; (3) CAP Arts Courses: distribution among HIR Student Learning Outcomes; (4) List of CAP Arts Courses with HIR SLO information; (5) CAP Courses Aligned to the HIR SLOs
- B. Discussion: This agenda item was postponed due to time constraints.

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Judy Owen